

## Scholarship Programs 2016-2020 Strategy

**I. Executive Summary:** Within the overall mission of OSF, Scholarship Programs take on the challenge of direct assistance to current and future change leaders in closed or closing societies, helping them explore the knowledge, ideas, and capacities essential to building a healthy civil society. Scholarships staff design and implement programs that help selected individuals earn internationally recognized credentials and absorb instructive experiences generated by cross-cultural immersion, propelling these individuals towards productive participation in positive social change. Key components of our work include strategic country selection, extensive recruitment, thoughtful selection, negotiated access to top-notch universities, intensive pre-academic preparation, steady pastoral care throughout the scholarship term, and a variety of initiatives designed to cultivate an international network of social change leaders.

Currently we offer two types of support: the **Civil Society Leadership Awards** (MA degrees in various social science and humanities fields), and the **Civil Society Scholar Awards** (non-degree academic project and research support across all humanities and social science fields). Both types are awarded via open, merit-based competitions. The CSLA program includes an intensive three-stage selection process informed by local perspectives and substantive engagement by international faculty and OSF expertise. Semi-finalists receive standardized test vouchers and face-to-face interviews where possible; finalists are matched to negotiated placements at partner universities scattered from Hong Kong to India, Turkey to Europe, the UK to the US. With admission confirmed, grantees then attend specialized pre-academic programs that prepare them for the demands of interactive classrooms and cross-cultural adjustments. Staff continue to serve these individuals throughout their studies, resolving problems and tracking their progress. Upon completing their degree, CSLA grantees may also compete for internship support, designed to help them bridge back to their home communities as fully credentialed and experienced professionals.

Civil Society Scholar Awards (CSSA) are more streamlined, zeroing in on the need to keep the flow of ideas through international networks alive for academics teaching in highly constrained and sometimes threatened higher education contexts. Testing assistance, facilitated admissions, and pre-academic preparation are usually not necessary for CSSA grantees; instead, staff work to link these intellectuals to each other and to OSF. Regional conferences in particular offer the chance to exchange ideas with peers and connect to OSF initiatives and CSLA grantees.

**Both** awards are offered in the following countries: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Cambodia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, North Korea (via South Korea), Lao Republic, Libya, South Sudan, Sudan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

Additionally, **Scholar Awards only** are offered in Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia, Burma, Guinea, Haiti, Macedonia, Mongolia, Nepal, Palestine, Papua New Guinea, Serbia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tunisia, and Yemen.

Going forward we see possibilities for improving our impact in three areas described below. The first, developing clear guidelines for country selection, is a priority for the immediate future (Fall 2015 and Winter/Spring 2016). The second, pursuing deeper engagement with grantees and alumni, will

unfold over time and should be clearly defined and internalized by Fall 2017. The third, improving data capture and analysis, is a longer term project that will synthesize ongoing discussions within the Individual Grants Working Group and external explorations with colleagues from other foundations, national academic agencies (UK, Canada, the Netherlands, Germany, France, the US), and partner universities.

All three goals—guidelines for geography, deeper attention to grantee experiences, better data capture—collectively speak to an overarching priority we see for the next strategic period, which is to improve the connection between the individuals we support and the work of building open societies that OSF undertakes. Each goal represents an opportunity for us to strengthen grantee awareness of and identity with OSF initiatives, underscoring how communities of individuals can, and do, effect positive social change.

## II. Notable Goals for 2016-2019

*A. Developing clear guidelines for our geographic reach.* Allocating award options to the countries listed above rests on an assessment of a country's status as "closed" or "high need"—"closed" being somewhere OSF generally cannot openly or easily operate, and "high need" being somewhere OSF is openly operating but local momentum towards open society is weak. In all of these countries, however, our goal is the same: to create opportunities for current or future social change leaders to expand their capacities and understanding via academic study and international network building. Over the past two years we have seen growing evidence that supports offering both types of award in all countries. Many countries on the "high need" list, currently eligible solely for the Civil Society Scholar Awards, do not have universities conferring local doctoral degrees across the social sciences and humanities. Professors sometimes do not even hold Masters degrees. Our hope to connect reform-oriented faculties to OSF issue areas is therefore stymied because large numbers of faculty in these countries have neither the academic status nor the international networks necessary to submit a competitive research project application.

We also see that for any country and for most issue areas, support for both practitioners (subsidized MAs) and professors (independent research) feeds progress more effectively. Most of the strongest applicants for the Scholar awards come from individuals who had previously earned their MA degrees abroad. Therefore, the impact of the MA support is broader than originally envisioned—support at this level creates opportunities in both professional and academic sectors. Finally, even though some countries can be considered completely "closed" (Turkmenistan, North Korea, maybe Eritrea), most follow trajectories within which some issue areas might be more progressive than others. Any given country's "status" is therefore fluid; the viability of regularly recalculating award allocation on the basis of status should be weighed against the benefit of a better alignment of resources to fluid demands, addressing geographic priorities in selection.

Analysis of recent selection and grantee data, along with case studies of various grantee and alumni profiles, will be used to inform discussions with the Global Board and others, leading to a clear set of guidelines for selecting beneficiary countries for Scholarship Programs. We very much welcome and rely on inputs from the Global Board in this exercise, which we hope can take place over Fall 2015

and early 2016. Our goal will be to have good guidelines in place by late Spring 2016, to align with the advertising and recruitment efforts we initiate in mid- to late summer.

***B. Deepening staff engagement with supported grantees and alumni.*** Designing a more inclusive approach to geography will be paired with cultivating a more nuanced engagement with the individuals we support. We increasingly recognize that the immersion of our grantees in alternative communities is an important part of their immersion in alternative *classrooms*. Three grantees linked to community groups in St. Louis, Missouri wind up clashing with local police at a public demonstration—this experience is instructive about freedom of speech. A grantee with significant physical challenges seeks local community services to find appropriate living accommodations—this experience is instructive about social responsibility. Paying closer attention to grantee experiences from selection interviews onward will reinforce the message that a grantee’s relationship to OSF is not simply about money, it is about joining a global community of people who pay attention, period. We will do this in part by showing up (in-person interviews as possible, site visits to host universities), and by staying engaged (regional conferences, Skype calls, ScholarForum). Evaluations of staff monitoring, host university realities, and previous alumni initiatives will be our medium-term goal over the first two years of the next strategy period, steering us towards program refinements to be introduced in the 2018-19 academic year.

One manager, Zoe Brogden, has already shown what can be accomplished with a little dedication and persistence. Making time for regular Skype calls with several recent alumni of the Doctoral Fellows Program (DFP), she realized that their research had direct bearing on the work of the International Migration Initiative. Abdusabur Abdusamadov (“Unsafe in the home of ‘big brother’: Sociological analysis of anti-Tajik-immigrant violence”); Muqaddas Pulotova (“Group Threat and Strategic Social Control of Minorities: The Case of Tajik Labor Migrants within the Russian Federation”) and Gulbahor Saraeva (“Post-Soviet Migration System Formation: Determinants of variations in sending states’ emigration policies of Post-Soviet Central Asia, Caucuses and Eastern Europe”) were all of interest to Anna Crowley, Program Officer at OSF’s International Migration Initiative, as she tries to build migration-related research and academic capacity in Central Asia.

***C. Improving data capture and analysis.*** Reflective practice and evaluation are obviously more productive when information—data—is easily accessed and clearly represented. Our third goal therefore is to design better data capture for the range of grantee and alumni interactions we have; staff are already exploring Foundation Connect options with an eye towards creating intuitive searchable records useful for longer term analysis. Current and future data capture can hopefully improve within a year, but capturing history will be a longer term effort. Recent requests from Mr. Soros for information on eastern European grant recipients stretching back to the late 1980s were relatively easy to meet, but the data was all in various Excel charts that were bulky to share. Understanding the intention of the request nevertheless proved instructive for establishing some

initial guidelines for which data we should capture in what format, and which might be better left to qualitative research. This effort will benefit from the experience and models of other individual grant programs such as the Ford Foundation's International Fellowship Program (two Scholarship staff currently participate on their longitudinal study committee), the Rockefeller Archives (tracing selection considerations back to the 1930s), the MasterCard Foundation (integrating evaluation at the outset of program launch), and larger government-funded exchanges (Fulbright, Chevening, NUFFIC, DAAD, CampusFrance, etc). Ongoing internal discussions with the Individual Grants Working Group are also very helpful for extrapolating ideas and options within OSF.

### III. Field Analysis

OSF Scholarship Programs is the only international scholarship program that specifically supports humanities and social sciences graduate study for citizens of conflicted, closing, and closed countries. The countries we prioritize, the intentionality behind our support of advanced study in the social sciences and humanities, and our existence within the OSF network render us unique in the field of international educational exchange. We are not the only organization with a belief in the power of the individual to effect social change, but we are the only one who acts on this belief by extending comprehensive assistance directly and competitively to individuals fighting for change in countries particularly burdened by severe democratic deficits and repressive governance. Our colleagues at the Scholar Rescue Fund and the Scholars at Risk network share our commitment to extracting scholars from threatening circumstances, but our approach is more proactive and more comprehensive—we are not simply responding to specific threats that arise for targeted individuals, but we are trying to thwart the negative social forces that create those threats in the first place.

Our work also diverges from government-funded politically charged initiatives. Fulbright and DAAD, the two largest academic exchange organizations, operate in almost every country where we do, but their selection criteria filter through diplomatic and domestic policy agendas that subtly warp their transparency and limit their outreach. By contrast, our recruitment networks, eligibility criteria, and final selection guidance are designed solely to elicit intellectual prowess and leadership potential from a wide swath of individuals in targeted countries. We frequently exercise selective affirmative action to ensure that non-traditional profiles have the same access to advancement as those with mainstream credentials.

Many individual grants programs tend to be fairly risk-averse. Our strategy is “risk-friendly”, not least because we are willing to make extra efforts to help unusual profiles excel in more traditional western influenced academic environments. By openly competing awards in marginalized countries we give new voices—Azeris, Sudanese, Cambodians, Haitians, many others—a chance to shape, change, and disrupt mainstream discourse.

A transgendered grantee from Columbia, speaking on a Disability Rights panel at our North American Regional Conference, challenged the value of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities as a tool for the transgendered community. Several grantees (one Uzbek and two Palestinians) at the Washington University in St. Louis helped local activist groups organize an event at the Missouri History Museum linking events in Ferguson, Mexico (where the students were abducted and killed), and Palestine as emblematic of targeted state violence. Told at the last minute that they had to drop the Palestinian angle, they then held a public protest outside of the

Real potential for tackling challenges to open society exists on the geographic, social, political, and economic margins as well as within familiar elites. OSF Scholarships bridge the experiential and intellectual divides between the two, and this is a key distinction of our approach.

OSF Scholarship Programs also stand apart from the crowd by recognizing that process matters: how we do what we do should reflect the values of the organization we serve. OSF staff and university partners handle application review and selection with a clear understanding of OSF's goals, incorporating an unusually high degree of sensitivity to applicants' home country realities. Importantly, the entire process is transparent. Awards are widely advertised via multiple media, applications are clearly marked "free of charge," online access is possible but not required in low bandwidth areas, and the decision-making rests with impartial assessors focused predominantly on academic merit. Scholarship staff participation keeps the reviewers open to non-traditional achievers, and alumni keep committees cognizant of the varying credibility behind local credentials. With the ultimate decision held by representatives of host universities, the key message is clear: local connections do not count.

#### **IV. Categories of Work**

Individuals are more likely to envision and effect change if they are equipped with the right tools: knowledge, experience, and networking skills. These are broad terms, and consequently our support to the field (individual grants for advanced study in the social sciences and humanities) hits most of the thematic categories currently proposed for classifying OSF expenditures.

Scholarship Programs grants to Education Advising Centers are also support to the field as they raise awareness of the value of international higher education, in addition to strengthening the competitive process by sharing information about scholarships, testing, academic disciplines, and intercultural realities, not to mention actively recruiting from local civil society networks. The Centers also serve to integrate returning grantees and alumni, helping them reconnect locally and reversing brain drain trends. Contracts and grants to these key players are classified within our general field support, unassigned to particular themes due to the Centers' service to a diverse constituency within the international educational exchange community.

Our concepts, the uniquely staff-driven parts of our work (summer schools and regional conferences), are designed to build communities of leaders linked to one another and to OSF. While our academic fields of study map to various OSF themes, our concepts are captured in the "unallocated: cross-cutting" category, because they support greater integration of the grantees with OSF generally, and funding cannot be allocated meaningfully between various thematic areas.

The bulk of our budget is allocated to the Civil Society Leadership Awards, which carry costs beyond our control (partial tuition, living stipends, insurance, travel, visas). Conversely, the bulk of our labor attaches to the initiatives we've created to prepare individuals for their study and to nurture their networking options during and after their academic terms. In a sense therefore we apply human resources to ensure the best possible outcomes for financial outlays.

The attached timeline represents the progression of a single award and the related costs and goals aligned with each major phase of activity. The second attachment reflects the budgets behind the activities, providing greater detail on the ratio of costs. We don't yet have a good representation of how staff time maps to each activity; because responsibilities are shared across multiple staff for any given activity, it is difficult to parse the daily realities very precisely.

## Field Support

Grants in this category logically encompass both support to external entities and the individual grants we administer—the latter having broad parameters allowing individuals to follow their own paths of study and intellectual development and the former for organizations playing an essential role in providing access to the information and support essential for taking up these opportunities.

### A. Individual Grants: CSLA , CSSA, and Internships

Civil Society Leadership Awards: full Master's degree scholarships (clustered at and cost-shared by carefully selected universities) in fields of study (law and justice, sustainable development and natural resource management, public health and social work, independent media, and education) that strengthen open society values. Support for internships and possibly home country projects will link recent program alumni to OSF-supported organizations and facilitate their return and engagement with worthwhile projects.

Civil Society Scholar Awards: mobility grants to doctoral students and faculty in the social sciences and humanities to help them pursue ideas and develop pertinent research questions in countries where universities are ill-equipped or unwilling to house a vibrant intellectual community.

The Civil Society Leadership Awards (CSLA) and the Civil Society Scholar Awards (CSSA) offer support via two very different structures: fully-funded MA degree with staff negotiated university placement (CSLA) versus mobility (small grant) support for a grantee-negotiated university placement of doctoral students and faculty (CSSA). Each carries very different cost implications. Our presidential portfolio review in October 2014 confirmed our claim that the value of MA support (and staff-negotiated placement) is the access it provides—access generally for individuals from countries marginalized by mainstream international education and access for persons from marginalized communities within those countries. Further, MA-level study provides access to an array of professions and/or to further study at the graduate level.

Adjustments to these models reflect deeper thinking on access, arising from an early April 2015 portfolio review with Chris Stone. That discussion centered on our Disability Rights Scholarship Program, and led us to the following plans for all of our work going forward.

First, although we have always included non-discriminatory statements on our applications, we learned that this is not the same as actively and knowledgeably recruiting and engaging with differently-abled individuals. We need to broadcast that accommodations for taking standardized tests, for international travel, for attending class, and for living in the new

community are, to the extent possible, part and parcel of our awards. An offshoot of this is that all selection teams need to know how to handle “functionally diverse” applicants such that interviews and communication with candidates are appropriately sensitized.

Second, we have learned that while host universities are prepared to work with a variety of needs on campus, there are limits to what they are mandated or able to do off campus. This means we have to pay attention to the host *community*, not just the host classroom—what social services will be available to the grantees to ensure their autonomy and inclusion in the broader community? Thorough understanding about what access really means for non-traditional profiles, coupled with clarity to any applicant about what they can reasonably expect with our support, are two practical adjustments we will make going forward.

Third, we expect a heavy demand for our awards from displaced students and scholars—the spike we’ve seen in applications from Syrians this year confirms this expectation. We need to ensure that flexibility on our residency eligibility requirement is properly constructed to ensure access to such profiles—meaning, that we must clarify our definition of “recently displaced” and which countries this flexibility applies to.

Finally, we will add a Chiang Mai-based summer school to the Istanbul summer program, which will provide better access to the benefits of pre-academic programming for our Asian grantees.

Internships and Home Country Projects: The Scholarship Programs’ post-graduate internships and Home Country Projects (HCPs) were created to bridge grantees’ academic experience to professional opportunities that could facilitate their return home.

Over the years we’ve offered two internship models: the first involved staff-negotiated placements and significant support from other OSF departments, the second relied on grantee-identified placements and, at times, greater university support. Under both models we offered a limited number of competitive grants to cover modest living costs for alumni to participate in a six to 12-month internship. Moving forward, we’d like to concentrate on staff-negotiated placements at organizations affiliated with OSF in order to reinforce connections between alumni and the OSF network.

In the past, home country projects provided small grants to alumni for projects ranging from advocacy trainings to mobile libraries and public health campaigns. We are currently debating continuing this line of funding; even though the projects in and of themselves can be impactful, we need more evidence that they constitute a viable pathway to post-scholarship home country integration. With this question in mind, we undertook an informal evaluation of alumni experiences in 2014, and are waiting for staff analysis of the results. Further research and evaluation is necessary to flesh out best practices for helping grantees bridge back to their communities.

## **B. Organizational Grants: Strategic Partners**

One of the standard mechanisms for repression in many countries is the withholding of information. Our grants to Education Advising Centers (EACs) combat this constraint in concert with performing essential local administrative tasks on our behalf. EACs publicize study abroad opportunities and recruit applicants from a variety of sectors and socio-economic status, advise students on possible educational paths, offer guidance on how to use the latest reference books on universities, standardized tests, and cross-cultural preparations—all of the seemingly mundane functions that are the heart and soul of transparency in environments distorted by economic imbalances and politicized access to opportunity.

### New Project: Education Advising for Refugees in Southern Europe

Students and scholars applying to our programs from conflict-ridden countries usually flee initially to neighboring countries. As recent disasters attest, many refugees are now heading to southern Europe, including significant numbers of university students and scholars. International and local organizations offer shelter, food and legal aid, but there are few efforts to connect these profiles to universities. The ‘Refugee Student Assistance Pilot Program in Greece and Bulgaria’ seeks to address this gap and is a joint initiative of the OSF-CEU Liaison Office, Open Society Institute Sofia, and Foundation SolidarityNet. The aim is to help young refugees navigate the complex admissions processes of European universities, including the practicalities of language tests and seeking scholarships. This has been successfully piloted with 11 refugees in Greece and Bulgaria. Mobilizing existing expertise in the Advising Centers of southeastern Europe, we propose to help scale up this effort by creating a network of virtual advisors providing displaced students and scholars with dedicated education advice via Skype or other online platforms.

## **Concepts: Pre-academic Summer Schools and Regional Conferences**

In addition to our inclusive practice and process, we see a unique opportunity to connect grantees to the power of the OSF network. We do this with summer schools and regional gatherings that reinforce the grantees’ sense of being part of a much larger community.

### **Pre-Academic Summer Schools**

Pre-Academic Summer Schools are designed to prepare new grantees for master’s level studies at our partner universities. We created and designed these schools in recognition that many of the constituencies we target (students and professionals in under-developed academic contexts) have had little to no exposure to modern academic demands such as heavy reading and writing requirements, active classroom participation, multi-cultural student populations, and current thinking in their field of study. Our model focuses on intensive academic writing, but also includes seminar-style social science courses. We zero in on research methods and critical thinking skills, and help students understand plagiarism and web-based resources.



The program is designed, organized and managed by Scholarship staff; we develop the curricular goals, hire the instructors, and work with host institutions to carry out the rigorous program.

Our unique capacity is in offering a holistic preparation that combines academic skills training with social experiences that foreground the more complex challenges awaiting the students at their host university environments. Summer school also offers a chance for grantees to sample topics outside of their primary discipline, which enriches their understanding of different perspectives and methodologies. We deliberately added trainings in Debate and Proposal Writing to hone critical thinking, argumentation, and public speaking (through debate), and through proposal writing, to build awareness of project-based activism. We ultimately want summer schools in Turkey, Southeast Asia, and Africa. Each will help us link grantees to civil society closer to home, setting the stage for sustained engagement with OSF.

*“Getting to know people from Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Egypt, Syria and a lot of different countries around the world gave me a whole new perspective about cultural differences and stereotypes. At the beginning, all the people looked new and different and I thought we just have in common an Open Society Scholarship and an interest in Human Rights. After a few conversations and class discussions, I realized we all have a lot of different things in common, like coming from countries that face inequality, poverty, and human rights violations. In the same way, we were all afraid of the stereotypes other people could have about our countries, even if they were true. I never thought a Kenyan could have such similar concerns as me, or that we have been working in the same area of human rights. It came to my mind, that the universality of human rights can be a tangible thing when it comes to violations, and that as bad as it can sound, is not the same talking about human rights violations when you come from a country like the US, or Canada, than when you have seen human rights violations your whole life.”—Natali Acevedo Guerrero (Colombia), McGill University Faculty of Law.*

## Regional Conferences

Regional thematic conferences are a new model for Scholarship Programs, aiming to strengthen our grantee-alumni networks and forge multiple connections and collaborations within the wider OSF network. We first tried this model in December 2013, hosting a conference for grantees and alumni from Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus (the six EU Neighborhood countries), in partnership with the CEU School of Public Policy. Titled ‘Futures of Democracy in the Eastern European Neighborhood’, the conference included over 100 current and former grantees in the region, most of them now working in higher education, civil society and the public sector. The conference coincided with the eruption of events in Ukraine, which meant it took on a momentum and energy we had not anticipated. The level of debate and strength of feeling at the conference was clear, both in relation to the events unfolding outside the meeting, but also coming out of a strong sense of shared values among the participants and a desire to work together across the network—with each other, and with OSF. We have continued to see this enthusiasm for finding a space to meet and talk with fellow grantees and alumni, and to connect with OSF’s wider work, at our recent European and North America Regional Conferences, as well as our forthcoming Central Asia Regional Conference in Bishkek.

Two key dimensions make the regional conferences model unique. The first is the extent to which the participants (grantees and alumni from the region) shape the agenda, through the use of online surveys and the submission of abstracts, analysis and ideas for speakers. They are as well the facilitators and presenters for most sessions. The second is the extent to which we involve our colleagues across the OSF network, including regional and thematic programs, national foundations and affiliated academic institutions. This involvement might be in co-hosting the event (such as our partnership with the CEU School of Public Policy or the American University of Central Asia in our forthcoming conference in Bishkek), or in contributing ideas and comments on the conference agenda, speaking on panels, and joining roundtable discussions with our grantees and alumni. In this capacity we have so far worked with OSIFE, OSIEA, Eurasia Program, Think Tank Fund, Education Support Program, Higher Education Support Program, Program on Independent Journalism, Justice Initiative, and International Migration Initiative.

These interconnections highlight the ways in which our grantee-alumni networks are a potential resource and support base for OSF's work in different regions, but there are a number of challenges we still face in making these connections come to life. The first is in keeping the conference themes broad enough to engage grantees and alumni from a wide range of backgrounds, whilst allowing for focused and productive discussion. Linked to that is how to capitalize on the diversity of academic, activist and policy perspectives in the room. The grantee and alumni-led roundtables and thematic cluster groups seem to be effective in bringing together participants working on similar issues and involving relevant OSF programs in the discussion. However, this participatory format can be challenging for some participants and may require professional facilitation. Other participants have expressed frustration as to how the ideas, findings, proposals and recommendations coming out of these discussions are captured, communicated and taken forward. We continue to grapple with the question of how we can harness conference energy so that it is not just an end in itself, but a potential catalyst for ongoing collaborations and engagement?

## **V. Shared Frameworks**

Scholarship programs are highly leveraged, and in a sense "shared framework" describes much of what we do: we negotiate shared costs, responsibilities, and mission with a variety of actors in order to advance our mission and implement our strategy. As referenced above, the regional conferences we produce are amalgams of OFS issue areas and geographic interests. Partnerships with the Human Rights Initiative, the Burma Project, the Higher Education Support Program, the Arab Regional Office, the China Program, and the North Korea/East Asia Initiative extend and shape our core work beyond the parameters of our flagship programs.

That said, what we've learned from existing collaborations is that new work improves existing work. CSLA and CSSA will offer better experiences to the profiles we seek because of what we now know from our work on the Disability Rights Scholarship Program. The Junior Faculty Awards for Burma are a prime example of how we are missing the mark with our Scholar Awards in contexts where local faculty have limited academic ties and weak local credentials. The China Program is challenging our longstanding assumption that Scholarships cannot hope to make a difference in that

vast society. If we can get a virtual advising network off the ground for refugees in southeastern Europe, we will test the power of earlier investments in Education Advising Centers to mobilize for new causes. Participating in a Shared Framework would similarly stretch our brains in new and useful directions to the benefit of our core mission.

None of the countries where we work are “easy”; all of the work we do serves the mission of building open societies. Labor is driven by number of awards—doubling down in the “hardest countries” would not reduce our headcount, in fact it would increase it, along with increasing our budget needs. We’ve learned that rigorous selection and thoughtful engagement probably shape our impact more than citizenship as such; hence the three goals described earlier, which strive to maximise the value of the resources we have.

Martha Loerke  
June 3, 2015